

REMARKS

In the Communication dated June 22, 2006, the finality of the Office Action dated April 7, 2006 was withdrawn. In that Communication as well as in the Office Action dated April 7, 2006, the Examiner maintained his position that claims 60 and 61 were directed to subject matter not previously "elected", although this application as filed contained only one claim -- claim 59, subsequently canceled in favor of claims 60 and 61 -- and no restriction requirement was ever issued. In view of this alleged "election", the Examiner canceled claims 60 and 61. However, in neither the Communication nor in the Office Action dated April 7, 2006 has the Examiner explained or provided any guidance as to what he considers as the subject that has allegedly been "elected".


The Examiner's supervisor, Steven Griffin, suggested in a telephone conversation with the undersigned on July 7, 2006 that a claim directed to a "use" might be favorably considered and might be directed to the alleged "elected" subject matter. Applicants' have therefore added new claim 62 directed to a "use". New claims 63 and 64 are directed to substantially related subject matter as new claim 62.

Consideration of new claims 62, 63 and 64 on the merits is respectfully requested.

It is believed that no fees or charges are required at this time in connection with the present application. However, if any fees or charges are required at this time, they may be charged to our Patent and Trademark Office Deposit Account No. 03-2412.

Respectfully submitted,
COHEN, PONTANI, LIEBERMAN & PAVANE LLP

By



Michael C. Stuart
Reg. No. 35,698
551 Fifth Avenue, Suite 1210
New York, New York 10176
(212) 687-2770

Dated: July 11, 2006